



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/630,315

07/31/2000

Naoto Kinjo

058744

5533

7590

09/12/2005

Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER

SETH, MANAV

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/630,315	Applicant(s) KINJO, NAOTO	
	Examiner Manav Seth	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8,15-29,38-41,43,45-51,53 and 57-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2-7,9-14,30-37,42,44,52 and 54-56 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8,15-29,38-41,43,45-51,53 and 57-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on April 25, 2005, has been entered in full.
2. Applicant's arguments on pages 18-26 in amendment filed April 25, 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 15-26, 38, 39, 45 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and with respect to claims 1, 8, 27, 40, 41, 43, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) respectively, have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments on page 22 of the amendment with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 2 and 9 has been fully considered and they are persuasive and therefore the rejection on claims 2 and 9 have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments regarding the prior art rejections on claims 15-26, 38, 39, 45 and 46 under Saber on pages 18 and 19 of the Amendment filed on April 25, 2005, have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
4. In the last paragraph of the page 18 and 1st paragraph of page 19, Applicant argues in substance:
 - a. "In Saber, a first extraction area is obtained by an adaptive color classification algorithm and is not obtained according to a shape of regular geometric form. In particular, the fitting of eigenvalues and eigenventures into an ellipse does not occur until after skin classification" and "Applicant submits there is

Art Unit: 2625

no disclosure of extracting a plurality of extraction areas as candidate specified image subject regions in Saber” as recited in claim 15.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. First of all, examiner answers a general question that would illustrate more on the current issues in the examination of this application. The question is: how would a system using a method will extract a subject, for example a human face, in an image, without identifying the subject in the image?. Examiner here asserts that a system cannot extract a human face in the image without identifying the face before, in the image and it is well known technical fact in the art of image processing. If it was a human, he/she would directly view the image and identify the face and draw the ellipse/circle around the face but if the same thing is to be done by a computer or a system, it cannot do what a human being does, a system has to identify the face of a human in the image using image characteristics. It is well known that to identify the face in the image using a system, image segmentation is required to separate the face from rest of the image and as well known image segmentation is done in various ways, which involves edge-based binarization, color based segmentation and applicant's specification recites the same in the 2nd last paragraph of page 28, where is uses edge extraction, as cited below by the examiner.

Art Unit: 2625

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

The face contour/circular shape extracting section 78 implements an edge extraction and a circular shape extraction using a face contour/circular shape extracting algorithm thereby extracting a face region as the specified image subject. That is, a human face is ordinarily elliptical so that the face contour/circular shape extracting section 78 extracts an elliptical or circular shape portion that is estimated to represent the human face and designates it as a candidate face region.

Applicant further clearly cites the edge extraction being nothing but image segmentation using binarization in 2nd paragraph of page 29 of the specification, as cited below by the examiner. The citation from the specification clearly educates that the face is extracted after the segmentation of the image, which is done using binarization or other techniques. Also, Examiner further asserts that applicant had admitted in the cited part of the page 29 of the specification, that this technique is from Published Japanese Patent Application No. 08-184925, and this application was published on July 16, 1996, which qualifies as a prior art.

Unexamined Published Japanese Patent Application (kokai) No. 8-184925 can favorably be used.

This technique is to extract only the region corresponding to the human face without being affected by the colors of the regions corresponding to the human face and the neighborhood thereof in the image. Image data is taken in and divided into a plurality of regions by binarization or other techniques; then, a pattern representing a human head contour, a pattern representing the human face contour, a pattern representing an internal structure of the human face and a pattern representing a human body are each detected from a plurality of the thus divided regions; then, candidate face regions are set in accordance with the respective detected patterns; weight

Saber clearly teaches "the algorithm consists of: 1) supervised skin/non-skin color classification, 2) shape classification and 3) eye, nose, and mouth localization" in (page 655, left column, 2nd paragraph) and further clearly teaches "First, an adaptive color classification algorithm is applied to the E and S channels to segment the image into two classes: skin and "other"" in (page 655, left column, 3rd paragraph). In the above disclosure by Saber, it clearly shows face identification by segmenting the image into skin portion and non-skin portion (the other part of the image) before extracting the area, same as done by the applicant. Saber clearly teaches shape classification, which extracts first extraction area according to the shape of regular geometric form of the specified image object by teaching "Then, the

Art Unit: 2625

eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the skin spatial covariance matrix are utilized to fit an ellipse to the skin region. The Hausdorff distance is employed as a means for comparison, yielding a measure of proximity between the shape of the region and the ellipse model” (page 655, left column, third paragraph) and further support can be found on page 656, left column, first paragraph and use of ellipse is well known as a shape of regular geometric form. Saber further teaches that once the face pattern is identified, eyes, nose and mouth can be extracted and this further has been emphasized by Saber in figures 1, 2 and 3, **thus conforming to the limitation “for each extraction area a plurality of extraction areas as candidate image subject regions” as recited in claim 15.**

Examiner concludes that one of ordinary skill in the art would require image segmentation to identify the subject in image before it is extracted by using and this is evident from the above citation from the applicant’s own specification and teachings provided by Saber. Therefore, claim 15 still stands rejected under the same prior art reference “Saber et al”. There is no substantial arguments provided for claims 16-26, 38, 39, 45 and 46, therefore these claims stand rejected.

5. Applicant's arguments regarding the prior art rejections on claims 1, 8, 27, 40, 41 and 43 under Nguyen and Saber on pages 19-21 of the Amendment filed on April 25, 2005, have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

6. In the 4th paragraph of the page 20, Applicant argues in substance:

Art Unit: 2625

b. “Assuming arguendo, Saber teaches the claimed precedent stage extracting a shape of regular geometric form of the specified image subject, the combination of Saber and Nguyen is not obvious”.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner first of all illustrates on the word “precedent” used in the claim 1 and all other respective claims. The word as well known stand for previous or as per the claims to the previous stage. Now, emphasizing on the claim 1 which recites a precedent stage (i.e. previous stage or a stage before), which extracts a shape of regular geometric form of the specified image subject under a predetermined condition, the next stage following the precedent stage is implementing another extraction algorithm under another condition to extract the results. Nguyen’s as from the title teaches segmentation, grouping and feature detection for face image analysis. Nguyen recites all the claimed limitations of claim 1 and other similar claims, as it can be seen from the figure 2, where a shape of the specified image subject using an ellipse is extracted in the stage before (precedent stage) the extraction of the eyes, nose, etc which is the succeeding stage under different condition of extraction. However, to further support this well known technique of extracting a shape of regular geometric form of the specified image, examiner cited Saber. Both Saber and Nguyen are directed to the same field of endeavor and they solve the same problem in the same field, therefore examiner asserts it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine both references, if needed, as per the motivation reasons provided in the rejection of the respective claims before. Also, Applicant has agreed to the fact that an ellipse (a standard geometric form) has been used by Nguyen on page 20 of the amendment filed April 25, 2005 in first paragraph which recites “an ellipse is not used in Nguyen until after a silhouette of a head image is

Art Unit: 2625

obtained by course-level edge-based segmentation”. Examiner, as previously discussed, asserts that image segmentation is required to identify the human face in the image, if extraction is to be done using a system. Examiner further asserts that applicant’s argument that if both references when combined, would result in improper detection of the image desired, is not persuasive as per the reasons provided earlier, as one of ordinary skill in the art would use image segmentation for identifying the subject in an image rather than directly extracting the subject image in the image when using a system.

7. In the 3rd and 4th paragraph of the page 21, Applicant argues in substance:

c. “Claim 27 and similarly claim 40 recites that the subsequent stage comprises “detecting a color or hue of the specified image subject. There is no indication that the subsequent stage comprises detecting a color or hue of the specified image subject”.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner cited (Section 1.3, Color-based segmentation, feature detection). Applicant argues that this information is provided by Cha reference not by Nguyen, however examiner here asserts that this teaching has been provided by Nguyen reference to which examiner points which belongs to Cha, which further provides the evidence that this technique of color analysis is well known prior to Nguyen’s reference. For further support, examiner also directs to Nguyen on page 594, right column, first paragraph, where Nguyen teaches “Once the head image is obtained, skin region segmentation and feature detection proceed, mostly independently until the last stage. Various histogram analysis are carried out to estimate skin intensity levels and feature contrast.....”. As well known, histogram analysis provides the color analysis of the image.

Art Unit: 2625

The above disclosure by Nguyen clearly teaches the use of histograms to calculate the skin intensity levels and feature contrast and as well known in the image processing art, the color or intensity range of an image varies from 0 to 255 where 0 being black and 255 being white and all other colors being in between 0 and 255 and this range is determined by using histograms. Also as discussed before, Saber does teach the use of color segmentation.

8. Applicant's arguments regarding the prior art rejections on claims 28 and 29 under Nguyen, Saber and Hasegawa on page 24 of the Amendment filed on April 25, 2005, have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

9. In the 4th paragraph of the page 20, Applicant argues in substance:

b. “Although the experiments in Hasegawa are performed in a standard indoor environment in the day time and in the evening, there is no indication that a predetermined extracting condition of a precedent stage comprises electronic or backlight information”.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. A system performs a image processing to detect and extract the face from the human and the lighting conditions are merged into the image when the image is taken or produced, not at the time when system extracts the face, therefore makes the merged light information a predetermined extracting condition. Hasegawa clearly in Section 5.1.1 teaches of different light variations (day or evening) in which image is taken and face is extracted. An electronic flashlight and backlight is another way of producing similar kind of light variations and the system doesn't care where the light comes from, it will extract the image in different light variations. Further adding more emphasis, Nguyen also

Art Unit: 2625

teaches compensation for merged lightning effects (page 594, right column, 2nd paragraph) regardless of the kind of light source.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 15-26, 38, 39, 45, 46 and 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saber et al (Face Detection and Facial Feature Extraction Using Color, Shape and Symmetry-based Cost Functions; IEEE Proceedings on Pattern Recognition, ISBN: 1015-4651).

Regarding **Claim 15**, Saber et al disclose a method of extracting a specified image subject, comprising the steps of:

performing image subject extraction processing by a specified image subject extracting algorithm or algorithms for each extraction area to extract a plurality of extraction areas as candidate specified image subject regions. (Figures 1-3; Pages 656-657, Section 2, Sub-sections 2.1-2.4, skin/non-skin classification and shape classification algorithms). Saber teaches that once the face pattern is identified and extracted, eyes, nose and mouth can be extracted and this further has been emphasized by Saber in figures 1, 2 and 3, **thus conforming to the limitation “for each extraction area a plurality of extraction areas as candidate image subject regions” as recited in claim 15.;**

Art Unit: 2625

performing a vote in an N-dimensional space of an image characteristic quantity for each extraction area extracted by said specified image subject extracting algorithm or algorithms (Figures 1-3; Pages 656-657, Section 2, Sub-section 2.5, cost function (5)); and

performing weighting of degree of certainty as a specified image subject based on an aggregation value of the vote within a section area for aggregation in said N-dimensional space (Figures 1-3; Pages 656-657, Section 2, Sub-section 2.5, cost function Formula (5), weighted combination of the cost function) Formula (10)),

wherein a first extraction area is extracted according to a shape of regular geometric form of the specified image object (Figures 2 and 3; Page 655, Section 2. Skin region has been extracted by fitting an ellipse to the skin region, i.e., extracting face as a regular geometric form or ellipse.).

Regarding **Claim 16**, Saber et al further disclose the method of extracting the specified image subject according to claim 15, wherein said image subject extraction processing by said specified image subject extracting algorithm or algorithms is performed through dividing it into a plurality of stages (Figures 1-3; Pages 656-657, Section 2, Sub-section 2.5, plurality of stages for eye, nose and mouth localization, and further plurality of stages based on cost functions C_n^1 , C_n^2 , C_n^3 for eye detection); and

said image subject extraction processing in a subsequent stage is preferentially applied to an extraction area in which said aggregation value in the voting space of said image characteristic quantity exceeds a predetermined value (Figures 1-5; Pages 656-658, Section 2, Sub-section 2.5, Thresholds t_1 and t_2).

Regarding **Claim 17**, Saber et al further disclose the method of extracting the specified image subject according to Claim 15, wherein said specified image subject

Art Unit: 2625

extraction processing by said specified image subject extracting algorithm or algorithms is performed through dividing it into a plurality of stages (Figures 1-3; Pages 656-657, Section 2, Sub-section 2.5, plurality of stages for eye, nose and mouth localization); and said image subject extraction processing in a subsequent stage is preferentially applied to an extraction area corresponding to said section area for aggregation within a preferential frame in the voting space of said image characteristic quantity (Figures 1-5; Pages 656-657, Section 2, Sub-section 2.5).

Regarding **Claim 18**, Saber et al further disclose the method of extracting the specified image subject according to Claim 15, wherein a combination of a plurality of image characteristic quantities selected from the group consisting of a position, size, direction or orientation of an extraction area and, a posture, density or color tint of an image subject is used as the N-dimensional space of said image characteristic quantity (Figures 1-5; Pages 656-657, Section 2, Sub-sections 2.1-2.5. Skin/non-skin classification and shape classification algorithms implement a plurality of image characteristic quantities consisting of position, size, direction or orientation of an extraction area (Face, Eye, Nose and Mouth) and, a posture, density or color tint of an image subject (Skin-non-skin color classification in YES color space).).

Regarding **Claim 19**, Saber et al further disclose the method of extracting the specified image subject according to Claim 15, wherein weighting value lowering processing is applied to a region within a predetermined area on a specific characteristic axis with respect to a neighborhood of the region, in which said aggregation value became large, in said N-dimensional characteristic stage (Figures 1-5; Pages 656-657, Section 2, Sub-sections 2.4-2.5. Principal axes of the elliptical skin classified region in N-dimensional eigenspace.

Art Unit: 2625

Eyes are located on a line which is parallel to the minor axis represented by the direction of the eigenvector corresponding to the smaller eigenvalues. Finding the minimum of the cost function in the eye region on horizontal minor axis is the weighting value lowering processing (Page 657, Formula (8)).

Regarding **Claim 20**, it is a conventional methodology in statistical decision processing to remove a remarkably large size or a remarkably small size from extraction data to increase the accuracy and reliability of extracting the subjects for recognition or classification purposes (Official Notice). Assigning lower values (sometimes even zero value) of weighting factors to the extracted data having large or small size in comparison to the mean value of the observed population of the data (outlier data), will remove a remarkably large size or a remarkably small size from extraction data.

With regards to **Claim 21**, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 15 are applicable to Claim 21.

With regards to **Claim 22**, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 16 are applicable to Claim 22.

With regards to **Claim 23**, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 17 are applicable to Claim 23.

With regards to **Claim 24**, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 18 are applicable to Claim 24.

With regards to **Claim 25**, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 19 are applicable to Claim 25.

With regards to **Claim 26**, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 20 are applicable to Claim 26.

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding **Claim 38**, Saber further disclose a method of extracting a specified image subject according to Claim 15, wherein said vote comprises an aggregation of points indicative of the specified image subject (Section 2.5, centroids of the “holes” within the skin segmentation mask).

With regards to **Claim 39**, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 38 are applicable to Claim 39.

Regarding **Claim 45**, Saber et al further disclose a method of extracting a specified image subject according to Claim 15, wherein said regular geometric form is circular or elliptical (Figures 2 and 3; Page 655, Section 2.).

With regards to **Claim 46**, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 45 are applicable to Claim 46.

Regarding claims **57 and 58**, claims 57 and 58 have been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1, 8, 27, 40, 41, 43, 47-51, 53 and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen et al (Segmentation, Grouping and feature Detection for Face Analysis; IEEE Proceedings in Computer Vision, ISBN: 0-8186-7190-4) in view of Saber et al (Face Detection and Facial Feature Extraction Using Color, Shape and

Art Unit: 2625

Symmetry-based Cost Functions; IEEE Proceedings on Pattern Recognition, ISBN: 1015-4651).

Regarding Claim 1, Nguyen et al disclose a method of extracting a specified image subject which successively implements a plurality of specified image subject extracting algorithms, comprising the steps of:

implementing an extracting algorithm of a precedent stage under a predetermined extracting condition to obtain an extraction result (Figure 1, connected component labeling to create a silhouette and extracting a head image; Page 594, Section 2.2);

changing an extracting condition of a subsequent stage so as to be adapted to the thus obtained extraction result (Figure 1, skin segmentation and face-orientation; Page 594, Section 2.2); and

implementing an extracting algorithm of said subsequent stage under the thus changed extracting condition (Figures 3-6, Pages 596-598; first and second columns in Figure 3),

wherein said precedent stage comprises extracting a shape of specified image subject (Figure 2, extraction of silhouette and head image).

Nguyen et al do not explicitly disclose extracting a shape of regular geometric form of the specified image object in precedent stage.

Saber et al disclose a face detection and facial feature extraction comprising extracting a shape of regular geometric form of the specified image object (Page 655, Section 2. Skin region has been extracted by fitting an ellipse to the skin region, i.e., extracting face as a regular geometric form or ellipse.).

Art Unit: 2625

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nguyen et al invention according to the teachings of Saber et al to extract a shape of regular geometric form of the specified image object in precedent stage because the regular geometrical shapes of human faces constitute the most accurate features to be utilized as attributes in facial image analysis.

With regards to **Claim 8**, arguments analogous to those presented for the corresponding limitations of this claim in Claim 1 are applicable to Claim 8.

With regards to **Claim 27**, arguments analogous to those presented for the corresponding limitation of this claim in Claim 1 are applicable to Claim 27.

Regarding **Claim 40**, Nguyen et al further disclose a method of extracting a specified image subject according to Claim 1, wherein said subsequent stage comprises detecting a color or hue of the specified image subject (Section 1.3, Color-based segmentation, feature detection).

Regarding **Claim 41**, Saber et al further disclose a method of extracting a specified image subject according to Claim 1, wherein said regular geometric form is circular or elliptical (Figures 2 and 3; Page 655, Section 2.).

With regards to **Claim 43**, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 41 are applicable to Claim 43.

Regarding **claim 47**, claim 47 has been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claim 1.

Regarding **claim 48**, as discussed before, Nguyen teaches face recognition where a face contour is generated, skin segmentation is performed to further extract plurality of regions in the face area and further performs histogram analysis on the skin intensity levels to better find skin areas (section 2.3). Color of human skin is well known to be known by a

Art Unit: 2625

person of ordinary skill in the art and therefore examiner asserts it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to use this predetermined color of human skin as a face extracting condition to further enhance the histogram analysis for face extraction with a higher probability of extracting a human face. Further as well known in the image processing art, the color or intensity range of an image varies from 0 to 255 where 0 being black and 255 being white and all other colors being in between 0 and 255 and this range is determined by using histograms and clearly the skin color according to the histogram would lie between 0 and 255 in gray range based on the average color rather than being strictly predetermined skin color. Also, Saber clearly provides the teachings that Chang (prior art) proposed a color segmentation and thresholding based algorithm to pinpoint the eyes, nostrils and mouth in color "head and shoulder" images. The skin segmentation is performed on a pixel-by-pixel basis, where a pixel is classified as skin if its chromaticity falls within a certain region of the chromaticity space (page 654, right column).

Regarding **claim 49**, claim 49 has been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claim 48.

Regarding **claim 50**, as discussed in the rejection of claim 48 both Nguyen and Saber clearly teaches segmentation of the whole image to extract the human face and then further teaches the extraction of extraction of eyes, nose etc. As well known in the art, different threshold levels are required for extracting different parts of the image. Examiner here provides examples with respect to this well known concept of image segmentation. When face is to be extracted from the whole image, the face is first of all required to be identified and that is done using binarization to detect the edges, which is done by

Art Unit: 2625

comparing to a particular threshold value, again this is a very well known technique in the image processing art. Further once the face is extracted, if to extract eyes, nose and other features of face, different threshold value is to be used against which the pixel values can be compared that belong to the same skin regions of the face and this is further taught by Saber. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to use a well known concept of segmentation to select different threshold values to clearly differentiate between different parts of the face regions and it is totally a user choice of what threshold value is to be used according to the design choice.

Regarding **claim 51**, clustering as well known is nothing but segmentation based on threshold and has been defined by both Nguyen and Saber which further teach extracting each of the regions for further analysis as discussed in the rejection of claims 1 and 47-50.

Claim 53 has been analyzed and rejected as per claims 1 and 8. .

Claims 59-61 has been similarly analyzed and rejected as per claims 15, 21, 47-51 and the response to the arguments with respect to applicant's arguments.

14. Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen et al (Segmentation, Grouping and feature Detection for Face Analysis; IEEE Proceedings in Computer Vision, ISBN: 0-8186-7190-4) in view of Saber et al (Face Detection and Facial Feature Extraction Using Color, Shape and Symmetry-based Cost Functions; IEEE Proceedings on Pattern Recognition, ISBN: 1015-4651) and Hasegawa et al (Real-time Parallel and Cooperative Recognition of Facial Images for an Interactive Visual Human Interface; IEEE Paper ISBN: 1051-4651).

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding **Claim 28**, Nguyen et al and Saber et al do not explicitly disclose a method of extracting a specified image subject according to Claim 1, wherein said predetermined extracting condition comprises electronic flash or backlight information.

Hasegawa et al disclose a real-time face recognition system comprising extraction condition regarding backlight (Page 386, Section 5.1.1, day time and evening lighting conditions).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nguyen et al and Saber et al combination according to the teachings of Hasegawa et al to consider electronic flash or backlight information as one of the feature extraction parameters because it will compensate for environmental or ambient brightness changes and will provide more accurate recognition results.

With regards to **Claim 29**, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 28 are applicable to Claim 29.

Allowable Subject Matter

Reasons for Allowance:

15. Claims 2-7, 9-14, 30-37, 42, 44, 52 and 54-56 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

In regards to independent **claims 2 and 9**, the reasons for allowance should be evident from the applicant's argument in 2nd last paragraph on page 22 of amendment filed on April 25, 2005. The prior art of record does not teach the limitation: "qualifying respective extraction processing conditions of said plurality of specified image subject

Art Unit: 2625

extracting algorithms in a subsequent stage according to the respective extracting states in a precedent stage” as recited in claims 2 and 9. Therefore claim 2 and 9 are allowed. All other claims depending on claims 2 and 9 are allowed at least by dependency on claims 2 and 9.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to provide processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled “Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance”.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Matsuo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,697,503, discloses a device and method for face image extraction, and recording medium having recorded program for the method.
- Benati et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,432,863, discloses automated detection and correction of eye color defects due to flash illumination.
- Tamura et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,040,860, discloses imaging apparatus for supplying images with rich gradation across the entire luminance range for all subject types.
- Kinjo, U.S. Patent No. 5,629,752, discloses a method of determining an exposure amount using optical recognition of facial features.

Art Unit: 2625

Applicant's amendments to the claims and addition of new claims necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. **Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manav Seth whose telephone number is (571) 272-7456. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta, can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



BHAVESH M. MEHTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Manav Seth
Art Unit 2625
September 06, 2005